



BRIEFING: SEPTEMBER 10, 2013 BOARD MEETING AGENDA ITEM # 3

TO: Chairman Richard and Board Members

FROM: Frank Vacca, Chief Program Manager
Scott Jarvis, Assistant Chief Program Manager

DATE: September 10, 2013

RE: Status Report on the Request for Qualifications for Construction Package 2-3

Background

In January 2013, Authority staff presented the Board with a status update of Construction Packages (CP) #2, #3, and #4. At that time staff intended to release one or more Request(s) for Qualifications (RFQs) for Construction Packages #2, #3, and #4 and indicated that the Construction Packages would extend south from Fresno to Bakersfield as follows:

- CP#2 – From East American Avenue in Fresno south to Lansing Avenue in the vicinity of Corcoran
- CP#3 – From Lansing Avenue in Cocoran south to Perkins Avenue/Elmo Highway in the vicinity of Allensworth
- CP#4 – From Perkins Avenue/Elmo Highway in Allensworth south toward Bakersfield with the actual length dependent on available funds.

Since January 2013, Authority staff has continued to examine options for proceeding with these RFQs and concluded that the best path forward is to consolidate CPs #2 and #3 and retain #4 as a separate procurement. The purpose of this presentation is to provide the Board with a status update on the release of the RFQs to interested Design-Build teams for design and construction for the next construction package (Construction Package 2-3 (CP 2-3)).

Discussion

The First Construction Segment (FCS), of the California High-Speed Rail Program will run through the Central Valley between Fresno and Bakersfield, and will involve multiple design-build contracts for the final design and construction of all trackway civil infrastructure up to the top of the ballast. A separate FCS design-build contract will be developed for the trackwork along the entire length of the FCS.

The approach for selecting and awarding the next design-build contract for CP 2-3 will be similar to that used for CP 1, specifically, a two-phase process designed to obtain the best value for the Authority. In the first phase, a RFQ is issued and each of the submitting teams is evaluated for their qualifications to perform the work. In the second phase, a Request for Proposals (RFP) is issued to each qualified design-build team with proposals due on a specific date.

Staff anticipates releasing one RFQ for CP 2-3 that would extend from East American Avenue south to approximately one mile north of the Tulare/Kern County line. It is located within the counties of Fresno, Tulare, and Kings and the cities of Fresno, Hanford, Corcoran, and Allensworth. The length of this segment is approximately 60 miles.

The process that staff proposes to use for evaluating the Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) will not substantively differ from the process used to qualify teams on CP 1.

SOQs will first be reviewed for responsiveness and to ensure financial capacity to deliver CP 2-3. The evaluation selection criteria has been altered from that of CP so that it is more uniquely tailored to the specific elements of CP 2-3 such that the Authority will be able to qualify the design-build teams best suited for this particular project. The elements the teams will be asked to address, and upon which they will be evaluated, will include:

- Past Performance
 - Past Projects
 - Past Safety Experience
- Design-Build Team
 - Organization and Management Approach
 - Key Personnel
 - SB/DVBE/DBE/MB Utilization
- Project Understanding
- Innovation in minimizing impacts on agriculture and other natural resources.

Staff anticipates that no less than three teams will be shortlisted to receive the RFP for CP 2-3; however, the Authority will retain the ability to shortlist any number of teams it deems to be in the best interest of the State. Only teams that are financially and technically capable will be shortlisted. Offerors will bear all costs of their SOQ submittal and will receive no stipend at the RFQ/SOQ phase of the procurement.

The RFQ will include a description of CP 2-3 and the associated work based on the Revised Draft Fresno to Bakersfield Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). Presently, alignments for CP 2-3 have not been finalized, and the RFQ will include a description of all alignments still under consideration. Once selected, the preferred alignment will be included in RFP for CP2-3.

The proposed service, labor, materials and work to be provided and performed by the selected Contractor include, but are not limited to the following general categories of scope:

- Scheduling

- Utility Investigation, Coordination, Protection, and Relocation
- Demolition and Clearing of Right-of-Way
- Code Assessment
- Completing, Coordinating, Securing Approval, and Executing Final Permitting and Utility Agreements
- Surveying and Mapping
- Subsurface Investigations
- Geotechnical Engineering and Seismology
- Final Design
- Estimating
- Value Engineering
- Environmental Mitigation and Environmental Commitments as applicable within the limits of Construction Package 2-3
- Construction
- Quality Control and Quality Assurance for Design and Construction
- Community Relations
- Quality Inspection and Testing
- Construction Safety and Security Program
- Preparation of CADD As-Built, Inclusive of Consolidated Service Drawings
- Interface Coordination for In-Scope Works as well as future works by others.
- Coordination with Jurisdictional Authorities (governments, public and private entities such as utility companies, CPUC, FRA, Caltrans, etc.)
- Coordination with Adjacent Railroads (i.e., BNSF, SJVRR)
- Provision of other related services associated with the design and construction of the project and the necessary to ensure the project's ultimate readiness for high-speed passenger rail operations.
- Engagement of Independent Checking Engineer and Independent Site Engineer.

The selected Contractor shall provide final design and construction for HSR trackway civil infrastructure, complete in place, up to the top of subgrade, plus an additional protective layer for purposes of protecting installed subgrade¹, including certain structural embedments, as appropriate, to mitigate/minimize future abortive work, (i.e., anchor bolts, embeds, grounding and bonding, foundations, etc.), retaining walls, access roads, and subsurface infrastructure (i.e., lateral ductbanks to future systems facilities sites terminated at manholes at HSR ROW) that could be used to integrate with future systems components currently not in scope. The Scope of Work also includes the design and construction of enabling works, such as grade separations and complete in place. These shall be generally coordinated, designed, and constructed in accordance with the local jurisdictional entity, but shall not undermine the design standards for the HSR alignment located above or below said facility.

The Scope of Work does not include:

¹ Installation of subballast shall not be deemed to suggest and/or imply the future design and construction of ballasted track. A decision has not yet been made on the trackwork type (i.e. ballasted vs. non-ballasted), except for location-specific conditions that may warrant an early determination. The selected Contractor shall therefore consider either scenario and prepare its design to accommodate and not preclude and/or compromise future works and clearances.

- Construction of trackwork (i.e. ballasted and/or non-ballasted section);
- Passenger station;
- Buildings;
- ROW engineering,
- Negotiations, and acquisition;
- Soundwalls; and
- Systems work (i.e., Overhead Catenary System poles, foundations, and wires, Traction Power Facilities, Automatic Train Control, etc.).

The Scope of Work also excludes civil/site works for said future systems facilities and ancillary sites, except access roads, which are in scope as described above (i.e., civil preparatory works are generally limited to the necessary improvements required for the HSR trackway).

Note that ROW Engineering, Negotiations, and Acquisition services are excluded from the Scope of Work. More definitive ROW availability and access information will be provided to the Contractor prior to Notice to Proceed.

The RFP will more clearly delineate the project limits and scope of work responsibilities described above. As called for by the Board's policies and procedures, staff will seek Board approval to issue the RFP.

Recommendations

No action by the Board is requested; this is an information item only.

Attachments

N/A